



**COUNTY OF PLACER**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT**  
CLARK L. MOOTS  
Director of Administrative Services  
**Procurement Services Division**  
2964 Richardson Drive, Auburn, CA 95603  
Phone: 530-889-7776 Fax: 530-889-4274

May 1, 2008

**RFP No. 9804**  
**Professional Design and Development Support Services for Hidden Falls Regional Park**

**Addendum No. 1**

**1. Pre-Proposal Conference and Site Visit Questions, Responses and Comments**

A pre-proposal conference and site visit was held on April 24, 2008, during which attendees were allowed an opportunity to pose questions to County staff to seek clarification on the requirements of this RFP. Because the responses may be beneficial to all prospective proposers, the responses are hereby provided as an addendum. In cases where this addendum may conflict with the original RFP, this addendum shall prevail.

The Attendance Sheet and PowerPoint presentation outline from the Pre-Proposal Conference, as well as a Psomas Draft Map, are available as separate documents posted on Procurement's website.

	QUESTION	COUNTY'S RESPONSE
1.	Has any topographical mapping been completed yet?	Yes, some aerial has been done, not much, but surveying is needed around bridges, staging areas and roadways.
2.	What help will be needed with the EIR, since it is already most of the way done?	More detailed information on bridges/amenities. Need initial detailed estimate. Detailed information will be needed to apply for Army Corps 404 permit and others.
3.	Are you looking for the bridge design to be the same as the Didion side? Are you happy with the current design?	Current design is one option. However, the County wants the consultant to be creative. Money is an issue.
4.	Are the bridges on or off site?	Five bridges are planned. Possibly two off-site, one with no access. We will also be looking for possible alternatives to reduce the necessary number of bridges while preserving functional circulation and emergency access. Grant funding for the trails expires in May 2009. Grant funding for the bridges expires in May 2010.

5.	Does the consultant need to meet with the Trail Forum?	<p>The consultant shall allow for at least one 2-hour meeting with the Trail Forum, which is tasked with laying out trail standards, and three meetings with the Cultural/Nature Education Forum. Costs for preparation, attendance, presentation, note taking, and production of minutes at these meetings shall be included in proposers' sealed cost proposals.</p> <p>Groups represented in the Trail Forum are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loomis Basin Horsemen's Association</li> <li>• Meadow Vista Trails Association</li> <li>• Folsom Auburn Trail Riders Action Coalition (FATRAC)</li> <li>• International Mountain Biker's Association (IMBA)</li> <li>• Sun City Lincoln Hills Hiking Club</li> <li>• Placer Land Trust</li> <li>• California Conservation Corps</li> <li>• Colfax High School Cross Country Running Team (representing the local high school area league)</li> <li>• Placer County Parks and Grounds Division</li> </ul>
6.	Is the trail alignment fixed or conceptual?	There can be adjustments subject to avoidance of sensitive areas. While we have spent a rudimentary amount of effort siting the bridge locations, we would be open to suggestion of alternate locations.
7.	Does the Cultural/Nature Education Forum have a role?	Yes, particularly in regard to development of thematic standards in Phase 1 and development of the ranch house in Phase 2.
8.	Are there other public presentations/public involvement foreseen that will require the consultant's time?	Same response as #5 above
9.	Did you have a consultant with you at the previous public meetings, or did the County go on their own?	Only the County.
10.	Did the County have a consultant for the existing trails/bridge?	<p>Yes, civil engineering, surveying, geotechnical, and construction oversight consultants. Consultants currently contracted for work at Hidden Falls Regional Park include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EDAW, Inc.</li> <li>• North Fork Associates</li> <li>• Placer County Resource Conservation District</li> <li>• AR Associates</li> </ul>

<b>11.</b>	Is it correct that only one bridge needs Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) specifications?	Correct, the remaining bridges are designated as pedestrian/equestrian with a desire to accommodate service vehicles. The size and type of service vehicles accommodated will be a function of cost and other constraints to be determined during initial design.
<b>12.</b>	Regarding connectivity – has there been any discussion about property purchase?  Should we include this in our scope?	Appraisal and real estate services will not be a part of this contract (Do not include in scope).
<b>13.</b>	What are the expected fees for Phase I?	The amount of funding we have available for professional design services (around \$250,000) is not necessarily reflective of the value of the work or its correspondence to the initial phase. Firms' proposals will be evaluated and rated on the basis of their response to the criteria published in Section 9.0 of the RFP. After proposal evaluations and selection of a firm, the sealed cost proposal of the successful firm will be opened. A negotiation process may be engaged with the successful firm/team prior to contracting.
<b>14.</b>	Are proposers to submit a preliminary schematic design for Phase I with the proposal?	No, County is looking for a narrative approach to bridge options given what is known at this time. Firms need not make a large investment of time in developing a specific design but rather show examples of country bridge work the firm has had experience with, or provide a conceptual approach to the bridge designs.
<b>15.</b>	Is there a vision for Class I access?	No.
<b>16.</b>	Will proposers need to suggest other improvements?  Will proposers need to submit ideas beyond what is in the EIR?	For purposes of evaluation and comparison of proposals, proposers should propose based on the format described in the RFP. However, the County values creativity and independent ideas that combine aesthetics of the property context with efficiency. So, proposers are encouraged to provide their independent assessment of the highest and best design features and processes even if they depart from the framework of the project description included in the RFP. Proposers may include their independent ideas in the Project Understanding and Approach sections of the proposal. Improvements and services proposed outside of the project description may be separately tabulated or clearly designated as supplemental items. If the proposer believes there are additional elements not included in the project description that are integral to a successful project, those elements should be described as such.

<b>17.</b>	Clarification regarding bridges per phase and design criteria.	<p>Phase 1 addresses the construction of two bridges with a possible third bridge. Phase 1A exact bridge crossings are unknown, and are to be identified in the initial study. The bridge site on the site visit located on the eastern side of the property is to be designed to support maintenance vehicles, and at a minimum, should support quad access. Optimal design would allow access with a pick up truck.</p> <p>It is important to consider the surface of the bridges for equestrian use. If Decomposed Granite (DG) were to be added for traction for the horses, the load capacity of the bridge would need to accommodate the anticipated extra weight.</p> <p>The Bridge in the central part of the park is to be designed for emergency access and H2O loading. Other considerations are to allow 12' horizontal with a 13' vertical clearance and adequate radius at the approaches.</p> <p>The bridge for the westerly end of the park was suggested as a part of the trail layout done as a part of the EIR and in conjunction with the trail forum. Currently, this bridge is not funded. The County has included it in the planning for Phase 1 to gather the necessary information and design to support future grant applications. This bridge would be to a design standard that supports multiple use trails and at a minimum provides access for quads, pick up trucks desirable.</p> <p>The other two Bridges mentioned at the pre-proposal meeting are to be studied as a part of the work in the Phase 1A - Connectivity Study. The study will help to determine the number of bridges and possible bridge sites needed to best link the trails systems. It is expected recommendation would be made as to the design options and estimated costs.</p>
------------	--	--

<b>18.</b>	Is the trail design a final design or will the County be looking for input on the design?	<p>For the purposes of this proposal, assume the County’s layout and trail construction details are established as part of the EIR. Flexibility will be accommodated to adapt to new conditions such as the final bridge approaches.</p> <p>The County does have trail clearing and excavation specifications.</p>
<b>19.</b>	Clarification of Section 6.2.1c of the RFP – Flood Plain Information	For the purposes of this proposal assume we can get volume data from the Flood Control District and plot that on a topographical survey provided by the consultant as a part of this project.
<b>20.</b>	Clarification of Section 6.2.1e of the RFP – Storm Water Treatment	As a part of the project the County will need to incorporate a storm water treatment program for all hard surface improvements. The development of a Plan to manage storm water run off will be a part of Phase 1 planning. An example of what the County would want to see is the treatment of hard surfaced areas in accordance with the most recent National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) standards.
<b>21.</b>	Clarification of Section 6.2.1f of the RFP and additional information about Garden Bar Road	<p>Psomas did the initial recognizance identifying probable areas of improvement as a part of the EIR process. An areal photo of the site has been completed. Attached is the Psomas Draft Map.</p> <p>Note: Proposers are hereby notified that the Psomas Draft Map is a working draft subject to change as the planning process progresses. In using the map, proposers shall take this into consideration.</p>
<b>22.</b>	What is the County’s priority with this project?	In addition to what is stated in Section 1.0 “Introduction” of the RFP, the County is looking for consultants with a good understanding of the project and project setting and the ability to perform in a manner consistent with meeting the grant funding timelines.

<b>23.</b>	<p>How do you want to receive questions?</p> <p>What is the process?</p> <p>Is there a deadline for questions?</p>	<p>E-mail or fax questions to Bob Bigney as specified in Section 1.0 of the RFP. Do not submit questions late in the RFP submittal period (i.e. less than 6 calendar days prior to the due date for receipt of proposals). Any addenda resulting from questions will be posted on the Placer County Procurement web page. Questions that do not merit inclusion in an addendum will be answered directly. The PowerPoint presentation will also be posted on the Procurement web page.</p>
<b>24.</b>	<p>What is the purpose for the corrugated pipe? (corrugated pipe protruding vertically from the ground along the creek as observed during the site visit)</p>	<p>The best understanding of the County is that the pipe is intended for use as a gauging station. However, the County Parks and Grounds Division has no information on its use or data produced.</p>
<b>25.</b>	<p>What is the relative timing between the trail construction and the bridge construction?</p>	<p>Following adoption of the EIR, trails are to be constructed right away prior to bridge construction.</p>
<b>26.</b>	<p>Can the County clarify which bridge is which?</p>	<p>See #17 clarification above.</p>
<b>27.</b>	<p>Will there be water service?</p>	<p>There are existing wells at Spears Ranch, but no utilities for the trails. There are existing wells and septic at the ranch house.</p>
<b>28.</b>	<p>Will there be any motorized use of the trails?</p>	<p>By the Placer County General Plan, all trails are multiuse, except in sensitive areas and cultural sites. However, trails will not be for motorized use.</p>
<b>29.</b>	<p>Are cattle fenced in?</p>	<p>Perimeter fencing is in place. However, there is little cross fencing and no fence between the Spears and Didion properties. The Spears family is responsible for maintaining confinement fences for the remainder of their grazing term (ending in 2014).</p>
<b>30.</b>	<p>Will there be an interpretive component?</p>	<p>There will be low maintenance signs at key stops, but only a few.</p>
<b>31.</b>	<p>Is there power to the site (Spears)?</p>	<p>Yes, at the ranch house.</p>
<b>32.</b>	<p>Will there be pools or swimming areas?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<b>33.</b>	<p>Who will be camping here?</p>	<p>For example, camping will be open to scout groups, but not to the general public.</p>

<b>34.</b>	What about bus access?	The County is looking at bus access and possibly off-site parking.
<b>35.</b>	Can you clarify which structures are to be demolished?	The main ranch house is expected to remain and be rehabilitated and remodeled. The remainder of the buildings on site will likely be demolished.
<b>36.</b>	In Section 6.2.1 of the RFP, are the services listed ranked by priority of importance?	The services listed in Section 6.2.1 are not in any particular order of priority.
<b>37.</b>	Can you confirm that the professional fees budget for Phase 1 and Phase 1A is \$200K?	See response to #13 above.
<b>38.</b>	Can you clarify the specific professional fees budget for Phase 1 and the specific professional fees budget for Phase 1A?	See response to #13 above.

The deadline for submitting proposals will remain: **May 21, 2008 – not later than 5:00 p.m.**

With the exception of the above noted items, all other requirements, terms, and conditions of this RFP remain in full force and effect.

Formal acknowledgement of this addendum is not necessary; however, your proposal shall consider and/or address the clarifications and revisions addressed herein.

Direct all questions regarding this RFP to:      Bob Bigney  
Placer County Procurement Services  
Email: [bbigney@placer.ca.gov](mailto:bbigney@placer.ca.gov)  
Phone: 530-889-4255